pcq

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,533	09/07/2000	Guido Maffezoni	ADAPP142	2330

25920 7590 10/13/2004

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 170
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER	
MAURO JR, THOMAS J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/656,533	MAFFEZONI, GUIDO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	2143	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.

   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-25*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☒ The drawing correction filed on *09 July 2004* is a)☒ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

10/4/04

William C Vaughn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented do not overcome the rejection given in the previous (final) office action.

(A) Applicant contends that Orr fails to disclose that the client logs in and provides a username or ID and password, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

Examiner asserts that, by definition (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th edition, definition for login (verb)), login means "to gain access to a specific computer, a program, or a network by identifying oneself with a username and a password." By Orr stating that "a user logs on to a client" (See Col. 3 lines 40-41), it implicitly provides, through the definition of the word "logs on", that a username and password are supplied. Therefore, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion as Orr, in fact, does imply a username and password.

(B) Applicant contends that Orr fails to teach that the client ID, i.e. username and password, is provided by the local client to the remote client using DCOM, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

Examiner asserts that Orr does teach the sending of client logon information, i.e. username and password, over a DCOM link. Orr teaches (See Col. 6 lines 37-44) that requests which are sent from a remote client to a server are sent via DCOM. Thus, for the login information to be transmitted from the remote requestor to the server, the information must travel from the remote requestor to the server and then to the VP Broker, VP Agent, etc. Because it travels from the remote client to the server over a network, DCOM is used. Therefore, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion as Orr teaches the use of a DCOM link over a network between the remote requestor and the server to transmit information, i.e. login information.

(C) Applicant contends that Orr fails to teach receiving confirmation from the remote client that the establishing has been completed, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

Examiner asserts that Orr clearly discloses that only after log-on information is sent to the VP broker that IPC resources are allocated. See Orr Col. 5 lines 66-67 - Col. 6 lines 1-6. It is implicit that the log-on information must match that of which is stored in order for such IPC resources to be allocated, otherwise there would be no need for sending the logon information. For example, when a user logs into a computer, i.e. Windows, the login information is sent to a service in Windows to verify the credentials, upon which, a session is established to access your files/GUI. Without the verification step, login credentials would not be needed. Thus, it is inherent and implicitly taught that verification of this login information is first required before any allocation of IPC resources.

(D) Applicant contends that Orr does not teach connecting the local client, i.e. remote client, to a selected adapter, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

Examiner asserts that Orr discloses starting/running an application and/or executing commands on a virtual desktop (See Orr Col. 6 lines 45-47). In order to run/execute these commands/applications stored on the server client, it is necessary and therefore required that the remote client be connected to or have access to the various disks in which these commands/applications reside. A hard disk is accessed through an adapter and therefore the remote client must be connected to such an adapter to allow them to run/execute programs.

(E) Applicant contends that Orr fails to disclose a first GUI which shows all applications and peripherals connected to a remote client, i.e. server, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

Examiner asserts that Orr clearly discloses that each client has a graphical display for a virtual desktop running on a server. See Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 40-61. This graphical display, i.e. GUI, allows the local client to have all applications/peripherals of the remote client, i.e. server, to appear as if they are located on the local client. This graphical display is a remote desktop of the apps on the server.

(F) Applicant contends that Orr fails to teach that the remote client and the local client may switch their functions/roles, whereas claims 4-5 contain these limitations.

Examiner asserts that any client/server can function as a client/server for another computer at any time. As is known in the art, any device or computer at any point in the time can access another computer, i.e. server, to access resources. At the same time, that device or computer can act as a server for another computer wanting some resource. As was upheld in In re Gazda (219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955)), reversal of parts, in this case switching a client to be a server and a server to be a client, is an obvious modification to a system.

(G) Applicant contends that the adapters described in Kempf are different than the adapters of the instant application.

Examiner asserts that the Kempf reference is used merely to show the use of an icon that provides direct access to a component. See Kempf Col. 6 lines 43-46 and the above rejection which further exemplifies the fact that Kempf provides the icon which allows the user to access an adapter object from the desktop. By definition 2(See Microsoft Computer Diction, 5th edition), an icon is a "visual

mnemonic allowing the user to control certain computer actions without having to remember commands or type them at a keyboard." Thus, the icon, as described in Kempf read on the language of the claimed invention.

(H) Applicant argues that Guheen uses user identification and passwords to access information in a web server, whereas applicant contends instant invention provides access to peripheral devices.

In response to argument H, Examiner asserts that Guheen does in fact teach access to peripheral devices. By definition, a peripheral is any device attached to the computer which the microprocessor controls (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th Edition), i.e. a hard drive. Therefore, because Guheen has access to information stored in the web server, he is thereby accessing an adapter, for example, the hard drive adapter, in order to run an application or execute a command stored on the hard drive of the server computer. During patent examination and prosecution, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 1184, 26 USPQ2d 1057, 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541, 550 (CCPA 1969). Giving the instant claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, "connecting and communicating with an adapter" is broad enough to read on the information accessed from the web server, i.e. hard drive of Guheen. Thus, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion.

(I) Applicant argues that McNeill communicates with SCSI devices using a SCSI bus, whereas the instant application calls for using a DCOM link.

In response to argument D, Examiner asserts that it is the combination of McNeill and Orr that discloses the communication using a DCOM link with a remote requestor which allows for access to SCSI devices. McNeill, as is shown in the rejection above, is used to provide the sending of inquiry commands to a remote client, specifically SCSI commands, in order to determine the adapters present [McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available]. Orr [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44] discloses using a DCOM link in order to communicate with a remote requestor, which is exactly what the applicant's instant invention claims. The motivation to combine these two references would have been obvious because a DCOM link was well known in the art at the time the invention was made as an easy and discrete way to distribute components between two computers running an application over a network.